

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 18, 21-23, 24 and 27-30. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 18-31 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 18-20, 24-26, 30, and 31 as being anticipated by Arrow, *et al.* (US Patent Number 6,226,751, hereinafter Arrow). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections and submits the following remarks for the Examiner's favorable reconsideration. The Applicant has further amended independent claims 18 and 24 to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention.

First, it is to be remembered that anticipation requires that the disclosure of a single piece of prior art reveals every element, or limitation, of a claimed invention. Furthermore, the limitations that must be met by an anticipatory reference are those set forth in each statement of function in a claims limitation, and such a limitation cannot be met by an element in a reference that performs a different function, even though it may be part of a device embodying the same general overall concept. Arrow fails to anticipate each and every limitation of claim 18, therefore, Arrow does not anticipate claim 18.

Claim 18 recites:

18. A method of coding data in a data package in a data stream, said data package containing information on a source of origin and a destination for the data package, wherein the coding takes place in a coding system containing a plurality of encoder/decoder (CODEC) algorithms for processing the data package, wherein:

an identification system attaches information to the data package, said information being provided from said information on the source of origin of the data package and its destination;

the coding system utilizes said attached information to select one of said plurality of CODEC algorithms for processing the data package; and

the coding system codes said data according to the selected CODEC algorithm.
(emphasis added)

The present invention is directed to an identification system which attaches information to a data package. Subsequently, a coding system utilizes the attached information to select one of a plurality of CODEC algorithms to process the data package and then codes the data according to the selected coding algorithm.

Arrow discloses a system which determines if a source and destination address belongs to the same VPN. If it is determined that the data packet is associated with a specific VPN, the system references a lookup table for determining algorithm for compression, encryption and authentication of the data packet.

The Examiner stated that Arrow discloses attaching information on a data package which uses a coding system to select form one of a plurality of coding algorithms. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization. Arrow does not attach any information to the data package for use in identifying a particular coding algorithm. Rather, Arrow discloses determining if a data package is part of a VPN, and from ascertaining that the data package belongs to a VPN, referencing a lookup table to find an algorithm for compression, encryption and authentication of the data packet. Arrow does not attach information onto the data package for this identification.

Furthermore, the Applicant has amended independent claims 18 and 24 and now recites that the plurality of CODEC algorithms are CODEC algorithms which are used for processing the data package. Support for this amendment is found on page 7, lines 1-16. No new matter has been added. The Applicant's claimed invention is directed to identifying a particular CODEC algorithm for processing a data package. Arrow merely using a lookup table to find an algorithm for compression, encryption and authentication of the data packet.

Thus, Arrow does not anticipate claim 18. In addition, claim 24 contains limitations analogous to the limitations of claim 18 and also is not anticipated by Arrow. Furthermore, whereas claims 19-20 are dependent from claim 18 and claims 25-26, 30 and 31 are dependent from claim 24, and include the limitations of their respective base

claims, they are also not anticipated by Arrow. Therefore, the allowance of claims 18-20, 24-26, 30 and 31 is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 21-23 and 27-29 as being unpatentable over Arrow. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections and submits the following remarks for the Examiner's favorable reconsideration. The Applicant has further amended independent claims 18 and 24 to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention.

As discussed above, claims 18 and 24 are not anticipated by Arrow. The combination of Arrow with the Official Notice that it is well known in the art to use coding algorithms in various communication systems also does not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claims 18 and 24. Therefore, claims 18 and 24 would not be obvious over Arrow. Therefore, whereas claims 21-23 are dependent from claim 18 and claims 27-31 are dependent from claim 24, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, they are also not obvious over Arrow. Therefore, the allowance of claims 21-23 and 27-29 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 18-31.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Roger S. Burleigh". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Roger" and last name "Burleigh" clearly distinguishable.

Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: October 6, 2008
Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com